1/3/72

Mr. Martin
c/o Senator Edward Kennedy
Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C.
Washington, D.C.

dear mr martin,

This letter is painful to me for reasons other than the fact that I almost lost a thumb yesterday. I write it without intent to use it but with the intent to use the questions I will ask and your answers or your failure to answer. You will please note that I have not addressed this letter to the senator, for to the degree consistent with my integrity I would prefer to continue to protect him, at least in history, from what I can at best categorize as the stupidity of those he sees to trust, those in whom he has vested his honor and that of his family.

As I wrote you, I have completed another book on the assassination of the president. It may seem paranoid to you, but I can conceive a connecting between that and what burke marshall has done. In confidence, because I feared this, the adverse effect it could have on the future if not the survival of the senator, I desired to prevent what is in today's times and every radio station. I therefore sought out senator charles mathias, who has known me for some years, and held him of some of the official evidence in this book, including what the warren commission did not have, some of what I have been beseeching you to see. senator mathias offered to speak to your senator. I asked him not to because I have long believed that his personal interest lies in maintaining a position of detachment on this question. If you will consult your files, you will find abundant confirmation of this. I asked senator mathias, to whom I am sending a copy of this letter, not to involve your senator. he reported to me that he had spoken to burke marshall, a friend of his, and that mr. marshall had assured him that what has just happened would not, that he, mr. marshall, who has the power, would prevent it. but it has, and in the name of your senator. If you are not aware of his legal authorities and obligations under the so-called contract with GSA, it might help you meet your responsibilities to read and understand that contract.

Why mr. marshall broke his word I do not know. why he selected an expert on urine and a self-styled expert on squeezing and alloing bullets, in this case as such a qualification as if bullets were identical with lemons, I also do not know. that mr. lattimore is a sycophant is beyond question. mr. marshall has seen fit to force into court my efforts to get only pictures of official evidence he has had the originals of, the clothing itself, shown to mr. lattimore, I can only conjecture. I cannot imagine any good either of these two things has done or can do your senator or his reputation or that of his family. I can and I do challenge you to confront the evidence in my possession that he hasn't the slightest idea of the rate evidence of this clothing and the enormous historical, if not more immediate harm, he has done your senator.

As you know, I have completed a new book. whether or not I can now find the funds to print it is at best doubtful. It is, in fact, unlikely. but it is and it will be an historical record. my personal integrity is involved in a number of ways, but most of all in a chapter entitled hoken, not camelot. unlike so many of those of whom I write and have written, I prize my integrity. therefore, I ask if what mr. marshall has just done he did

after consultation with or at the direction of your senator and in either case, on whose initiative. i would like to know whether mr. marshall had consulted any authentic experts in this evidence who have a public record of disagreement with the official "solution" to the assassination of the president and so informed the senator. i would like to know if mr. marshall informed the senator that mr. lattimore is an expert on arabs, not pathology, and does not meet the contractual definition of either pathologist or expert, etc. did he tell the senator that there is this overt violation of the contract in the senator's name? did he tell the senator that i am either the first or one of the first to whom he denied access (in november 1966, in 1970 and in 1971) to that to which he has given mr. lattimore what amounts to an exclusive on both evidence and what so clearly under the law is PUBLIC information? did he do this in the senator's name, as he did, with or without the senator's personal knowledge and/or agreement? did the senator know and did he agree to the elaborate stage-management propaganda or whatever you elect to describe the exclusive to th new york times? you have to know, because i wrote you, that i knew of this and did nothing adverse to the interest of the senator or mr. graham. but i am its victim, and i do think the damage to me and my work is considerable and to a degree censurable. i may elect to pursue this further, so you should understand the context of this question. this is to say nothing of what i regard as damage to the national honor and integrity and, whether or not you have the reason to conceive it, to the senator. has the senator, personally, ever examined any of the evidence involved, has he ever had or sought any truly impartial evaluation of its meaning or that of any of the evidence or of the report of the warren commission? i have assumed the negative in all these questions, but in the senator's name this has progressed past the point where a writer intending responsibility can rely on his personal analysis or beliefs. i therefore ask for a direct and unequivocal answer. does the senator have any knowledge, from whatever source or sources, of the acts questions as they relate to the late senator robert kennedy.

i will now consider myself at liberty to use your refusal to answer any of these questions. i will also consider that i have the right to use any answers in the absence of credible reason to consider any answer or answers confidential.

i conclude with what i mean as a sincere hope, that the senator will survive the trust, devotion, integrity, loyalty and judgment of david korn, r.r. marshall and you. otherwise, you might want to consider living with what may be recorded as famous last words. they have just been uttered in his name, with a maximum of contrived attention and, whether or not you know it, a minimum of truth.

sincerely,

harold weisberg